

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF EVELYN
CHRISTINE HALL

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Evelyn Christine Hall who passed from this life on April 16, 1995, at the age of 60.

Evelyn Hall was born on November 8, 1934, in Covington, TN. Fondly referred to as "Mickey," Evelyn was a loving wife, mother, and friend who touched the hearts of many.

After completing high school in 1952, Evelyn moved to Chicago where she met her husband, Johnnie Marshall Hall. To this union were born five loving children, two sons and three daughters. She was employed by the U.S. post office in 1964, and retired from service in 1976. However that did not slow her down. In 1985 she received her salespersons license in real estate and eventually her brokers license. She even added another feather to her cap in 1994 when she received her associate of arts degree from South Suburban College in Illinois.

Evelyn leaves to cherish her memory, a loving husband, Johnnie M. Hall, Sr.; 2 sons: Rev. Gregory R. Hall and Johnnie M. Hall, Jr.; 3 daughters: Natalie D. Hall, Cora J. Layrock, and Shiela A. Hall-Frazier; a stepdaughter, Margaret A. Hall; 2 brothers: Eddie and Lloyd Coward; 16 grandchildren; 2 great-grandchildren; 1 special aunt, Evelyn Bates; and a host of cousins and friends. As you can well see, she will be greatly missed by many.

I am honored to enter these words of tribute to Ms. Evelyn Christine Hall into the RECORD.

AMERICA'S CITIES

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues a wonderful article written by the Honorable Raymond L. Flynn, United States Ambassador to the Vatican. Ambassador Flynn had a distinguished career as mayor of Boston before his current service as Ambassador, and is very well informed of the problems and crises facing American cities. As an acknowledged expert in Urban Affairs, Ambassador Flynn has a keen interest and useful insight into solving the pressing problems of our cities. I would like to share a copy of Ambassador Flynn's article as published recently by Urban Affairs Review and commend it to my colleagues.

AMERICA'S CITIES—CENTERS OF CULTURE, COMMERCE, AND COMMUNITY—OR COLLAPSING HOPE?

(Raymond L. Flynn)

Perhaps the greatest obstacle facing cities today is the changing nature of the definition of city. The term city formerly signified a social center wherein large populations gathered to live, to exchange goods and ideas, and to develop and sustain a system that provided for the needs of its inhabitants. The very word had connotations of hopelessness, a place where "they" live. People demand greater measures against crime, welfare fraud, and illegal immigration. Underlying these demands, however, is the sentiment held by many Washington officials that few resources should be dedicated to urban areas—and to those who dwell within them.

In 1968, the Kerner Commission (U.S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders) issued a warning that America was in danger of being divided into two nations: one white, one black. Presently, the United States faces the prospect of becoming a gated community—confining the poor within the city limits, separating them from those better off in the suburbs. Instead of seeking solutions to the problems of the cities, the cities themselves, along with the people living in them, have been incorrectly identified as the problem. If this misperception continues, more will be at stake than our cities. Indeed, the very values on which our nation was founded—equality, and life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—will be placed in jeopardy.

The question has been asked, Why should we concern ourselves with cities? It has been suggested by some high-ranking officials and sociologists that cities have outlived their usefulness. It is argued that new technology and the world economy have made cities obsolete and that we should discard them like unproductive units in a company that needs downsizing.

This utilitarian approach to the modern city ignores the reality that cities are made up of much more than material and human resources. The people are the heart of the city and cannot be reduced to a pool of disposable "goods" in an economic system. Cities are much more than economic entities; therefore, the human side of urban life cannot be ignored.

There are many compelling motives for turning our attention to the problems of the modern city. Among them are the following:

1. Cities have always been, and will always be, places of refuge, where those in need seek the support and comfort of others. They are centers for opportunities and hopes, where ideas, talents, and native intelligence are translated into a mutually energizing and life-giving environment conducive to the development of both culture and commerce. The historic roots of our nation remind us that nearly all of our families entered the American mainstream through cities. Most of these families arrived by ship, crossing one border or another, legally or illegally (and, many times, in the "gray area" in between). Cities in the United States kept the promise inscribed at the base of the Statue of Liberty—to receive "Your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." No matter how far we may have come since then, we cannot forget the

values of the cities that were home to them. To do so would be hypocritical, denying to new immigrants the promise offered to our ancestors by American cities.

2. From a purely economic perspective, it would actually be less expensive to spend more rather than less on cities and the people living within them. The cost of urban misery is astronomical. From furnishing prison beds to caring for low-birth-weight babies, from providing for health care for AIDS victims and the elderly to feeding the urban poor, the cost of the barely living index is exorbitant. This growing moral deficit pulls not only on our consciences but also on our economy. The expense of preventive programs can reduce the cost of urban neglect.

3. From a socioeconomic perspective, saving urban America might be in everyone's self-interest. It seems that the rumors of the death—and decrease in importance—of cities are greatly exaggerated. Cities are again seen for what they have always been—economic engines that create and distribute wealth. In an upcoming book, Neil Pierce argues that city-states are replacing nations as the key units of production in the modern global economy (Spence 1994, 11). Michael Porter, author of *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (1990), talks about the "untapped economic potential" of cities, especially as hosts for the "clusters" of industry he sees as the driving force in the new economy (Porter 1994, 11). Yes, capital is mobile, but it has to land somewhere. Invariably, it is in cities. But which ones? A new school of thought, with proponents such as Paul Romer, an economist at the University of California at Berkeley, Lester Thurow of M.I.T., and Michael Porter of Harvard, holds that cities attract investment to the degree that they can bridge the income gap with their surrounding suburbs. Romer states that "maybe even the rich can be worse off from inequality" (Bernstein 1994, 79).

These sentiments are being echoed on the political front by Democrats and Republicans alike. Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich recently warned that "A society divided between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' or between the well educated and the poorly educated . . . cannot be prosperous or stable" (Bernstein 1994, 79). Republican theorist Kevin Phillips, who traces the growing inequality to a transfer of wealth from the middle class not down to the poor but up to the rich (Bernstein 1994, 79) agrees with this assessment. He remarks that economic stratification is contrary to the American sense of fairness and equality.

Where did we go wrong? How did we lose the idea of equal opportunity that has been part and parcel of city life? At the moment, it is fashionable to ascribe the plight of our cities to the failure of the urban policies of the 1960s and 1970s. Fashionable, but false. There are at least four factors that have contributed to the present situation.

1. Even as the urban policies of the 1960s and 1970s were being initiated, the "suburbanization" policies that began in the 1950s were continuing. Superhighway subsidies and low-interest mortgages accelerated the process of urban disinvestment. Cities began to spruce up their front yards and put out the welcome mats while the moving trucks were pulling up to the back door, carrying away not only the furniture but, more important, the families that form

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.